

**Meeting of the Community Safety Scrutiny Committee**

7<sup>th</sup> July 2009

Report of the Director of Neighbourhood Services

**2008/09 FINAL MONITORING REPORT – FINANCE & PERFORMANCE**

**Summary**

1. This report presents outturn figures for :
  - a) revenue and capital expenditure for the Neighbourhood Services portfolio
  - b) directorate plan priorities and key performance indicators.

**Background**

2. This paper reports on service and financial performance for 2008/09.

**Management Summary**

Financial Overview

3. Overall, the Neighbourhood Services portfolio has an underspend of £465k, a variation of 2.9% on the net expenditure budget. This compares to a predicted underspend of £115k in the third monitoring report.
4. The outturn for the general fund portfolio shows expenditure of £16.06m compared to budget, an underspend of £210k which represents a variation of 1.3% on the net expenditure budget.
5. The significant variances relating to the trading accounts are covered in further detail in confidential Annex 2 with these being transferred to the Trading Reserves.
6. The outturn for the SYP (Safer York Partnership) portfolio shows an underspend on budget of £21k which is included in the overall total at paragraph 3.
7. The financial position for each General Fund service area is dealt with separately in the following sections. The overall position can be summarised as follows:

	Exp Budget £000	Income Budget £000	Net Budget £000	Outturn £000	Var'n £000	Var'n%
Env Health & Trading Standards	3,155	762	2,393	2,350	(43)	(1.8%)
Licensing & Bereavement Svs	1,115	1,933	(818)	(859)	(41)	5.0%
Registrars	389	355	34	(8)	(42)	(123.5%)
Neighbourhood Management	1,606	360	1,246	1,200	(46)	(3.7%)

Ward Committees	809	0	809	690	(119)	(14.7%)
Neighbourhood Pride Service	2,434	73	2,361	2,336	(25)	(1.1%)
Enforcement and Environment	696	5	691	694	3	0.4%
Waste Mgmt, Refuse & Recycling	12,283	2,772	9,511	9,591	80	0.8%
Pest Control	102	56	46	69	23	50%
<b>General Fund Total</b>	<b>22,589</b>	<b>6,316</b>	<b>16,273</b>	<b>16,063</b>	<b>(210)</b>	<b>(1.3%)</b>

8. There are revenue carry forward requests totalling £205k. These are detailed from paragraph 42. If these are approved the overall underspend within the Neighbourhood Services general fund portfolio totals £5k.
9. The revised budget for capital schemes is £311k and the outturn spend is £207k and it is proposed that the underspend of £104k is carried forward. Further details are provided from Paragraph 49.

### Performance Overview

#### **Organisational Development Performance**

10. A staff based improvement programme called 'Excellence in Everything' has been commenced, with 50 volunteers from across the directorate working on 6 priority areas.
11. 28 RIDDOR accidents – generally the same as RIDDOR levels over the last 5 years. Major injuries dropped by 50% and no dangerous occurrences were reported in year.
12. Sickness absence reduced by 28% from 15.5 to 11.3 days lost per fte.
13. 95.6% of PDRs were undertaken.
14. A programme of equality awareness raising, and equality impact assessment training has been completed. But just 1 of 9 EIAs was fully completed by the end of March 2009.

#### **Service Performance**

15. Highways Infrastructure, Parking Services and Registrars Service transferred into Neighbourhood Services during the year.
16. Total BCS crime fell by 1%, exceeding the target set out within the Community Safety Plan, and almost meeting the 2010/11 target.
17. Improved public perception figures from Talkabout and the Place Survey across a range of crime and anti-social behaviour indicators. NPI17 (level of concern with anti-social behaviour (LAA)) improved to 11.2% (top quartile).
18. Set up 53 Cold Calling control zones, covering 74 streets and 2567 properties.

19. NPI4 (residents who feel they can influence decisions in their area LAA) came in at 31.5% (top quartile). York became a good practice partner with DCLG for our approach to participatory budgeting.
20. Building Maintenance service took over gas servicing in the whole of the city without any problems.
21. 95.3% of urgent repairs were completed within government timescales( 90% in 07/08) and on average we took 6.63 days to complete non-urgent repairs (7.97 days in 07/08). This improvement despite a 17% increase in the number of repairs completed on behalf of Housing Services. Satisfaction with repairs among tenants exceeded 90% in June 2008.
22. Performance on street cleanliness has declined. We missed targets on all 4 sub-elements of NPI195 – for example 195a (areas with unacceptable levels of litter) rose from 7.6% in 2007/08 to 8.9% in 2008/09. Performance on litter and detritus remains well ahead of performance before the barrowmen way of working was rolled out in April 2007.
23. Performance on graffiti (NPI195c) went from 2.3% to 4.7% during the year, but this masks a blip in summer 2008 that we worked hard to control and deal with. Performance in the spring 2009 survey was much improved at 2.2% with an increasing proportion of areas (54%) surveyed that had no graffiti at all visible.
24. Groves waste trial undertaken from October 2008. While timescales slipped slightly we now have a clear path forward to meeting government targets of having all properties on kerbside recycling by end of 2010
25. Improved the level of residual household waste collected (NPI191 – LAA) from 663 kg in 2007/08 to 629kg in 2008/09. This beats the LAA target of 640kg.
26. Recycling and composting rose from 43.4% to 45.1% (NPI192)
27. The proportion of municipal waste landfilled improved from 57.5% to 55.1% (NPI193).
28. Satisfaction with waste collection as measured through the Place Survey rose from 75% to 79%. This is pleasing as we were one of the highest performing authorities that had moved to alternate weekly collection, and suggests that a culture of recycling is continuing to embed.
29. The number of missed bins fell from 50.6 to 41.3, and the proportion of those bins collected by the end of the next working day rose from 79.9% to 96.9%.
30. The number of complaints about the waste service fell by 7%, and a programme of NVQ training for waste operatives including customer care has been started. Initial signs are that the number of complaints will drop and a challenging target has been set on this.

## Financial Performance

### **General Fund**

#### **Environmental Health and Trading Standards**

31. The outturn position is an underspend of £43k or 1.8% of the net expenditure budget. This compares to a breakeven position reported at monitor 3. The key reasons for the underspend are as follows:
- A net underspend of £31k on staff costs due to vacancies
  - An overspend of £38k on legal fees for the Elvington Airfield appeal. If the appeal is successful then these fees will be recovered.
  - Other underspends are in relation to additional income from licenses £14k which are expected to be a one-off for this year only; £13k underspend on court costs; £10k underspend on equipment.
  - Full funding of the Noise Patrol team has been identified as an issue for 09/10 and is proposed that £24k of the above underspend be requested for carry forward. Further details are provided in paragraph 48.

#### **Licensing and Bereavement Services**

32. The outturn position is an underspend of £41k, or 5.0% of the net budget. This compares to a breakeven forecast at monitor 3. The key reasons for the underspend are as follows:
- Additional income of £20k in respect of the Licensing Act and £8k in relation to the Gambling Act.
  - Additional income from Crematorium fees has been realised of £43k, which has been partly offset by related staff costs of £17k.
  - Urgent repairs to Cremators gave an overspend on budget of £19k.

#### **Registrars Service**

33. The outturn position is an underspend of £42k, against a net expenditure budget of £34k. This compares to a breakeven forecast at monitor 3. The key reasons for the underspend are as follows:
- £63k additional income mainly from outside marriages.
  - This is offset with an overspend on employee costs in relation to the above of £21k.

## **Neighbourhood Management**

34. The outturn position shows an underspend of £46k, or 3.7% of the expenditure budget. This compares to a £40k underspend at monitor 3. The key reasons for the underspend are:
- An underspend on Community Engagement of £23k. It is requested that this underspend be carried forward for support to sustained citywide youth engagement and integration to the ward committee process. Further details are provided in paragraph 43.
  - The Target Hardening budget has underspent by £24k of which £11k is committed expenditure. It is requested that the total underspend is carried forward. Further details are provided in paragraph 44.
  - A £1k overspend on other budgets

## **Ward Committees**

35. The outturn position is an underspend of £119k, or 14.7% of the net expenditure budget. This compares to a forecasted underspend of £85k in monitor 3. The main reason for the variance is:
- The £120k relates to an underspend on ward committee funding of which £116k is committed expenditure. The remaining £4k is unallocated. It is recommended that the total underspend is carried forward as detailed in paragraph 45.
  - A £1k overspend on other budgets

## **Neighbourhood Pride Service**

36. The outturn position shows an underspend of £25k, or 1.1% of the expenditure budget. This compares to a £24K underspend at monitor 3. The key reason for the underspend is:
- A £25k underspend was achieved on the abandoned vehicles contract as the number of vehicles is less than expected
37. The operational costs of street cleansing and ground maintenance are held within the trading accounts. This is covered in further detail in Annex 2.

## **Enforcement and Environment**

38. The outturn shows an overspend of £3k, or 0.4% of the net expenditure budget. This compares to a breakeven position forecasted at monitor 3. The main variance is:
- An underspend on the York Pride budget of £2k. It is proposed that this is carried forward as detailed in paragraph 46.

## **Waste Management, Refuse & Recycling**

39. The outturn shows an overspend of £80k, or 0.8% of the net expenditure budget. This compares to an overspend of £34k at monitor 3. The main reasons for the overspend are:
- There is an underspend on waste processing costs which are mostly offset by corresponding overspends in operational budgets as resources are redirected to increase recycling collection and thereby decrease the amount of waste tonnage sent to landfill.
  - A £12k underspend on the Waste Minimisation market research budget is requested to be carried forward as detailed in paragraph 48.
  - There has been unbudgeted expenditure on security at Towthorpe HWRC of £84k. This was required because previous withdrawal of security has resulted in break ins.

## **Pest Control**

40. The outturn shows an overspend of £23k, or 50.0% of the net expenditure budget. The main reason for the overspend is:
- A shortfall of income has occurred on this account during the year compared to costs.

## **Traded Accounts**

41. Detailed information is provided in Confidential Annex 2.

## **Revenue Budget Carry Forward Requests**

42. The following carry forwards totalling £205k are requested in order to complete projects for which revenue funding was set aside in 2008/09 but which were unable to be completed within the year.

## **Neighbourhood Management**

43. £23k underspend on Community Engagement is requested to carry forward.
- This will support the sustained citywide youth engagement and integration to the ward committee process.
44. It is requested to carry forward £24k of Target Hardening budget.
- £11k of this carry forward relates to slippage on committed schemes and it is recommended that this is carried forward so that these schemes can be completed.
  - The remaining £13k is unallocated. £10k for approved schemes that will not now progress and a further £3k due to schemes coming in under budget. It is proposed that this is also carried forward to fund projects in 2009/10.

## Ward Committees

45. £120k of Ward Committee funding is requested to carry forward.
- £116k of the carry forward request relates to schemes that are already committed. The completion of these schemes was delayed due to external factors or the schemes commenced later in the financial year. It is proposed that this is carried forward to complete the committed schemes.
  - The remaining £4k is uncommitted expenditure due to schemes coming in under budget or not coming to fruition. It is recommended that this budget is carried forward to assist with the development of projects in 2009/10.

## Enforcement & Environment

46. The York Pride Budget has underspent by £2k, which was uncommitted at year end. If this is carried forward it can assist in funding schemes identified for 2009/10.

## Environmental Health and Trading Standards

47. Full funding of the Noise Patrol team for 2009/10 has been identified as an issue during the budget process. It is proposed that £24k of the underspend be requested for carry forward to provide the full service in 2009/10.

## Waste Management, Refuse & Recycling

48. The Waste Minimisation market research budget has underspent by £12k. It is requested that this be carried forward to assist with the implementation of the growth bid to continue the rollout of kerbside recycling which was approved during the 2009/10 budget process.

## Capital Programme

49. The Neighbourhood Services capital programme includes schemes within Neighbourhood Management, Waste Management, Environmental Protection Unit and Neighbourhood Pride. Details of the budget and outturn are set out below:

	<u>Current Budget</u> £000s	<u>Revised Budget</u> £000s	<u>Outturn</u> £000s
Ward Committees	172	131	100
Waste Infrastructure Capital Grant (WICG)	110	0	0
Air Quality Management	27	27	21
Contaminated Land Investigation	42	42	30
Silver Street Toilets	263	91	30
Improvement to Towthorpe HWRC	20	20	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>634</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>207</b>

50. The latest 2008/09 budget reported at monitor 3 was £634k but this has decreased to £311k as the budget for the following were slipped:
- £41k into 2009/10 on the Ward Committee Schemes

- £172k in to 2009/10 on the Silver Street Toilet Scheme
- £110k into 2009/10 on the Waste Infrastructure Capital Grant

51. The progress on delivering the projects within the programme and a comment on the variances for each scheme is outlined below:

Ward Committees

Budget: £131k (CYC resources)

Outturn: £100k

52. The scheme underspend totals £31k. £15k of the underspend relates to slippage on 16 schemes that are committed but were unable to complete before the end of the financial year.
53. It is proposed that the £15k is carried forward with the remaining £16k being an underspend in this area.

Waste Infrastructure Capital Grant (WICG)

Budget: £0k (Defra Grant)

Outturn: £0k

54. This is a new grant from Defra for which we will receive funding over the next three financial years (2008/09 £360k, 2009/10 £361k and 2010/11 £133k). The purpose of this grant is to enable local authorities to invest in front end waste infrastructure, notably for recycling and composting.
55. The Waste Strategy Report to Executive on the 23rd September 2008 outlined the proposals for this grant to purchase containers to extend the recycling service across the city. Trials in respect of how best to implement this are currently in progress. There will be no expenditure incurred against the grant until 2009/10.

Air Quality Management

Budget: £27k (Defra Grant)

Outturn: £21k

56. The grant relates to air quality monitoring, air quality modeling and air quality action planning.
57. The replacement of the air quality monitoring station on Lawrence Street was not operational by the end of the financial year and £4k will be required to complete the project, expected early May 2009.
58. It is recommended that the total underspend of £6k is carried forward.

Contaminated Land Investigation

Budget: £42k (Defra Grant)

Outturn: £30k

59. Defra have provided a capital grant to support some detailed contaminated land investigations at three sites in accordance with obligations placed on the council by Part 11A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.



60. The grant provided for the financial year 2008/09 has underspent by £12k, which is required for committed schemes, which will be undertaken in 2009/10. It is recommended that this be carried forward.

Silver Street Toilets

Budget: £91k (CYC Resources)

Outturn: £30k

61. The 2008/09 budget was reprogrammed to slip £172k into 2009/10 at monitor 3 due to a delay in the tendering process. The alteration of the specification was required after additional stabilisation works were identified delaying the process still further leading to an underspend on the revised budget of £61k which is requested for carry forward.

Improvements to Towthorpe HWRC

Budget: £20k (CYC Resources)

Outturn: £26k

62. Funding was approved to make structural improvements at Towthorpe HWRC. Additional health and safety work has been required resulting in an overspend of £6k on this scheme.

Directorate Performance

**Performance indicators**

63. This section sets out the results of an analysis of NS performance indicators during 2008/09.
64. Annex 4 sets out a list of NS National Performance Indicators – including LAA indicators, and priority local indicators set out in the directorate plan for 2008/09.
65. Annex 5 sets out a full list of NS service indicators (those in 2008/09 service plans and directorate plan, and the targets set in 2009/10 service plans and directorate plan).
66. Annex 6 provides the 2009/10 NS Directorate Plan – setting out the directorates’ priorities and targets for the current year. This document was agreed at the Neighbourhood Services EMAP meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> March, and updated following the agreement of the new corporate strategy in May 2009.

LAA Indicators

67. Annex 4 shows our National Performance Indicators – including our LAA indicators. NS has 6 LAA indicators.

	Total reported	On target?	Improving?	Declining?
LAA Indicators	5 of 6 (83%)	4 of 4 (100%)	3 of 4 (75%)	1 of 4 (25%)

68. NPI4: Community Engagement: % of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality. NS has been named the lead directorate on this Place Survey indicator, but in fact all directorates and agencies will influence the outturn through their activities. No target was set for the PI as we had no comparable

background data. The overall figure was 31.5%. Initial feedback from Marketing is that this will be top quartile performance. A target of 34.3% has now been set.

69. NPI191: Waste Management: Kilograms of residual (ie landfilled) household waste collected, per household. The performance is 629kg, against a target of 640kg, and a performance in 2008/9 of 663kg. This is a 5.1% improvement year on year in the weight of waste per household going to landfill. The waste minimisation strategy will have had an impact on this reduction, as will success in diverting over 45% of waste away from landfill (43% in 2008/09). However factors out of our control (economy, national trends on sustainable packaging) will also have helped to reduce this figure. Looking ahead, the waste service plan sets out targets to offer kerbside recycling to 98% of properties by 2010/11, and to landfill less than 50% of our waste by that year – which should complement continuing waste minimisation work. Initial data from Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) benchmarking club suggests that this is upper 2nd quartile performance.
70. NPI16: Community Safety: Serious Acquisitive Crime. There were 3459 serious acquisitive crimes recorded in York in 2008/09. This is a 4% rise on 2007/8, but still remains 20% lower than the 2006/7 figure. Despite increasing, this level of crime meets the target for all three years of the LAA. NPI16 is made up of a number of crime types, including burglary, robbery and vehicle theft. Overall domestic burglary rose 14% year on year, robbery of personal property fell 47% year on year, theft of a vehicle fell 11% year on year, and thefts from a vehicle rose 4% year on year. Initial data from PWC suggests that this will 3rd quartile performance.
71. NPI17: Community Safety: Concern with Anti-Social Behaviour. This is a measure of the proportion of Place Survey respondents who have significant level of concern about a range of seven types of anti-social behaviour. The outturn figure was 11.2% - an improvement on the 14% baseline figure from 2006/7, and exceeding the target of 13% set for 2008/09. We believe that this is top quartile performance, which is unsurprising as levels of concern with anti-social behaviour have been comparatively low in York in previous years. Home Office have advised not to set a LAA target for this measure – but a target of 9.4% has been set for 2010/11 within the NS Directorate Plan.
72. NPI30: Community Safety: Reoffending of prolific and priority offenders. This is a Probation Service indicator. Based on data for the 12 months to Dec 08 (ie at Q3 08/09) there has been a 32% reduction in re-offending in the cohort of offenders – exceeding the 20% target. We have therefore treated this as on target and improving, although the final position is not yet known.
73. NPI38: Community Safety: Drug-related (Class-A) offending rate. This is a DAAT indicator, whose introduction was deferred until 2009/10. A baseline will be available in July 2009. Targets have been set.

#### **National Performance Indicators (including LAA indicators)**

74. Annex 4 shows NS National Performance Indicators – including our LAA indicators. Overall NS/CDRP has 36 NPIs 'live' during 2008/9. The table below shows headline figures on the number on target, improving and declining. These are set out by LSP partner group, by NS/CDRP, and overall.
75. Overall:

- 50% of the NPIs that had a target set hit that target,
- 50% of the indicators improved, where we can measure improvement.

By LSP theme	Total reported	On target?	Improving?	Declining?
Inclusive City NPIs	2 of 2 (100%)	0 of 0	0 of 0	0 of 0
Sustainable City NPIs	12 of 12 (100%)	5 of 10 (50%)	5 of 10 (50%)	5 of 10 (50%)
Safer City NPIs	16 of 22 (73%)	5 of 10 (50%)	4 of 8 (50%)	4 of 8 (50%)

By NS/CDRP	Total reported	On target?	Improving?	Declining?
NS indicators	17 of 17 (100%)	5 of 12 (42%)	5 of 10 (50%)	5 of 10 (50%)
CDRP indicators	13 of 19 (68%)	5 of 8 (63%)	4 of 8 (50%)	4 of 8 (50%)

Overall	Total reported	On target?	Improving?	Declining?
National Indicators set	30 of 36 (83%)	10 of 20 (50%)	9 of 18 (50%)	9 of 18 (50%)

### **Inclusive City**

76. NPI3 is a Place Survey PI that measures the level of civic participation in the local area. The result of the survey in 2008/09 was 12.3%. We understand that this was in the third quartile. This indicator is not in the directorate plan or any service plans.
77. NPI4 is a Place Survey LAA indicator – reported above.

### **Sustainable City**

#### ***Waste Management:***

78. All three NPIs improved and hit their target.
79. NPI191 is an LAA indicator – reported above.
80. NPI192 and NPI193 measure how successfully we are in diverting waste away from landfill. Both indicators show that we have improved diversion rates in 2008/9, and that both measures met their target. Initial data from PWC suggests that NPI192 will be top quartile, and NPI193 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile. Future targets set in the Waste Service Plan reflect the waste and waste minimisation strategies – and show that by the end of 2010/11 we will have rolled out kerbside to all properties where this is cost effective and reasonable, and that less than 50% of all waste will be going to landfill.

81. Place Survey result for BV90a (satisfaction with household waste collection) came in at 79% satisfied. This continues the rise seen last year. (72% in 2006/7, 75% in 2007/8).

### **Local Environmental Quality**

82. NPI195a-d measure the proportion of areas around York that suffer from unacceptable levels of litter, detritus, graffiti and fly-posting. These four indicators are measured by survey three times a year – the aim being to get a generally representative picture of the level of environmental quality across the city. In 2008/9 performance on all four indicators declined slightly.

NPI195	Litter NPI195a	Detritus NPI195b	Graffiti NPI195c	Fly-posting NPI195d
2007/8	7.6%	8.9%	2.3%	0.3%
2008/9 performance	8.9%	11.0%	4.7%%	1.1%
2008/9 target	8%	8%	2%	0%

83. The results for the 3 surveys carried out in 2008/09 are set out below.

NPI195: Survey	June 07	Oct 07	Feb 08	June 08	Oct 08	Mar 09
Litter Fail rate	2.3%	8.5%	12.0%	10.3%	4.6%	11.8%
Detritus Fail rate	4.1%	4.1%	18.4%	8.4%	10.6%	14.0%
Graffiti Fail rate	1.1%	3.0%	2.9%	7.9%	4.0%	2.2%
Fly-posting Fail rate	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	2.6%	0%	0.8%

84. Based on initial PWC data, our fly-posting performance will be bottom quartile, while litter and graffiti performance will be 3rd quartile, and detritus 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile. However limited reliance should be placed on comparative data for NPI195 due to a continuing concern over the consistency of surveying between authorities.

85. To put these results into perspective, the table below sets out performance on BV199 (translating the NPI195 results into BV199 results – BV199 was the previous measure) back to 2004/5 – and shows that the new approach to street cleansing to tackle litter and detritus introduced in April 2007 continues to deliver improved results.

BV199	2004/5	2005/6	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9
Litter	19%	18%	15%	12.3%	13.9%
Detritus	28%	27%	24%	14.9%	17.9%
BV199a (Litter & detritus)	24%	22.5%	19.2%	13.5%	15.8%
BV199b (Graffiti)	Not measured	7.8%	6%	3.9%	6.8%

BV199c (Fly-posting)	Not measured	1%	0%	0.5%	1.8%
-------------------------	-----------------	----	----	------	------

86. The margin of error on the full year (900 site) survey results for litter and detritus is about +/- 2%.
87. So for the litter fail rate of 8.9%, this means that 19 times out of 20, the true percentage is likely to be in the range 6.9% to 10.9%. Rather than presenting the data as a shift from points 7.6% to 8.9%, it could be presented as a shift from ranges 5.6%-9.6% to 6.9%-10.9%. These ranges overlap significantly so in general terms these are very stable results. Detritus levels as measured by the survey are also stable.
88. Work is ongoing to maintain momentum among the barrowmen and NPS crews. But it must be noted that motivation has been hit by Pay & Grading – all staff in this area have appealed. The service continually seeks to shift resources around in reaction to demand and ‘hot-spot’ data, and to improve on its way of working, using the data available to it. But a key difficulty is a lack of high quality management information covering the city’s environmental condition on which to base decisions. Much work has been done in 2008/09 along with colleagues in Easy @ York to design improved work processes that will make the service more efficient and responsive, and to introduce mobile technology so that staff can report issues that they see as they are out and about. The project has been delayed, but will deliver by the end of 2009 calendar year. The project’s use of mobile technology will provide significantly better management information on which to base everyday resourcing decisions.
89. In response to the NPI195 results in 2008/09, a number of additional initiatives have been taken:
- Developing educational material for schools in relation to impact of littering. Students at Canon Lee school will help us to design materials to roll out to other schools.
  - Attempt a new approach to deep cleaning in ‘high obstruction housing’ areas. The annual clean tied in with the gully clean will continue, but we will also undertake a second deep clean without formal parking restrictions – writing to residents to warn them and asking them if they would be willing to move cars.
  - Treat recreation areas as hot-spots during the summer in order to clear away litter related to ‘drinking parties’.
90. These initiative will be undertaken within resource, so not all areas can be treated as hot spots.
91. Graffiti levels peaked in summer 2008 survey. A range of actions were taken in partnership with North Yorkshire Police to tackle the problem we faced. In the March 2009 survey, graffiti levels had returned to the normal trend level – with 54% of areas surveyed having no graffiti at all (compared with 42% in June 2008). This is an area that we will need to continue to monitor as there are some indications that graffiti levels are starting to rise again as they did last summer.

92. NPI196 is a measure of the effectiveness of actions taken by the local authority to counter fly-tipping. The measure is a rating based on two measure – the amount of fly-tipping that takes place, and the amount of enforcement undertaken. In York in 2008/9 the recorded level of fly-tipping rose 34%, while enforcement activity rose by 56%.
93. Throughout 2008/09 there was a significant increase in the number of fly-tipping loads from small van load size upwards. This may be a reflection of the economic pressure placed on businesses with the result that some people resort to fly tipping as opposed to tipping at an authorised site where they would have to pay. Throughout the year the emphasis has been placed on education and enforcement action. This in turn can and does have an effect on the number of incidents reported both by the public and officers reporting incidents themselves. It is believed that a combination of these factors have influenced the rise in reported fly-tipping. There is no evidence thus far that the HWRC permit scheme has had any effect on levels of fly-tipping – although clearly we will keep this under constant review. Efforts are being made to concentrate existing resources on increased commercial waste inspections, together with ongoing targeted education and information for households.
94. Due to the new arrangements around TalkAbout and ResOp / Place Survey we have much less high quality customer perception information this year. Talkabout 31 (July 2008) reported a rise in satisfaction across a number of LEQ questions – with 69% of residents rating the street where they live as excellence or good (65% in 2007/8). This continued a generally upwards trend since 2005. The Place Survey result for BV89 (satisfaction with service: keeping land clear of litter and refuse) remained at 67%. 2nd quartile in 2006/7 was at 66% so our figure seems likely to be about average.

### ***Highways***

95. NPI168 and NPI169 are survey measures of the condition of the York highway asset. Both measures improved in 2008/09 and hit target. Data from PWC suggests that NPI168 (A-road condition) is top quartile, while NPI169 (other road condition) falls in the 3rd quartile of authorities.

### ***Place Survey – High Level Satisfaction Indicators.***

96. NPI 5 and 138 are place survey high level satisfaction measures. The result for NPI5 showed that 87% of respondents were satisfied with their local area. This is in the top quartile based on initial comparative information.
97. The result for NPI138 showed that 91.9% of respondents aged over 65 were satisfied with both home and neighbourhood. Again we believe that this is in the top quartile.

### **Safer City**

#### ***Regulatory Services***

98. Three national indicators measure the performance of regulatory services in York.
99. NPI182 is a survey measure of the satisfaction of local businesses with the range of local authority regulatory services. This is a new indicator and the outturn was

76%, against a speculative target of 80%. Data from PWC suggests that this will be 3rd quartile performance.

100. NPI183 measures the impact of local authority regulation on the fair trading environment. The outturn figure is 0.92%, which is a measure of the number of significant issues that we are called to deal with minus those that we have dealt with, scaled against the extent of trading activity in the area. PWC data suggests we will be in the top quartile on this measure.
101. NPI184 measures compliance of food businesses with food hygiene law. Performance in 2008/9 showed that 88% of local food businesses are 'broadly compliant' with food hygiene law. This is lower than the 89% in 2007/08 and missed the target set of 93%. PWC data suggests we will be in the top quartile on this measure.

### **Crime and Community Safety: Recorded Crime Levels.**

102. Six indicators measure recorded crime levels across different types of crime. The table below sets an overview of recorded crime in the last three years. The targets in the table are those set within the Community Safety Plan (and LAA for NPI16).
103. LAA measure NPI16 is reported above.
104. Of the other 5 measures, 3 got worse and 2 improved.

Code	Indicator definition	2006/07 outturn	2007/08 outturn	2008/09 outturn (NYP)	2009/09 outturn (QUANTA)	DIFFERENCE TOTAL	DIFFERENCE %	Target 2008/09	Target 2009/10	Target 2010/11	Change 07-08 to 08-09 TOTAL	Change 06-07 to 08-09 TOTAL	Change 07-08 to 08-09 %	Change 06-07 to 08-09 %
<b>NPI 16</b>	Serious acquisitive crime rate	4311	3330	3459				3591	3696	3512	-129	852	4	-20
<b>Constituent parts of NI 16</b>	Aggravated Domestic burglary (incl. attempts)	10	5	5				9	9	8	0	5	0	-50
	Domestic burglary (incl. attempts)	1081	989	1126				976	927	880	-137	-45	14	4
	Robbery of Business property	24	14	45				22	21	20	-31	-21	221	88
	Robbery of Personal property	169	137	73				143	136	130	64	86	-47	-54
	Theft from a vehicle (incl. attempts)	2383	1680	1749				2133	2026	1925	-69	614	4	-26
	Theft or unauthorised taking of vehicle (incl. attempts)	660	492	437				596	566	536	55	223	-11	-34
	Aggravated Vehicle Taking	14	13	24				13	12	11	-11	-10	86	71
<b>NPI 15</b>	Serious violent crime rate	n/a	96	113				92	89	86	-17		18	
<b>NPI 20</b>	Assault with injury crime rate	n/a	1024	1239				990	956	922	-215		21	
<b>NPI 28</b>	Serious knife crime rate	n/a	67	60				64	62	60	7		-10	
<b>NPI 29</b>	Gun crime rate	n/a	2	5				2	2	2	-3		150	
<b>Others</b>	Criminal Damage	4189	3697	3630				3781	3592	3412	67	559	-2	-13
	Theft of a Pedal Cycle	1414	1198	1014				1276	1212	1152	184	400	-15	-28

105. Data from PWC suggests that NPI29 (gun crime) will be top quartile, despite getting worse this year. NPI15 (serious violent crime) and NPI20 (assault with less serious injury) will be in the 3rd quartile.

106. Knife crime (NPI28) improved slightly in 08/09 and falls into the 2nd quartile. There were no cases on murder related to domestic violence (NPI34) during 2008/09.
107. Crime and community safety data is somewhat confusing. While four of the NPIs showed higher crime year on year, the overall level of recorded crime in York fell by 1% in 2008/09, and now is 16.5% lower than the level recorded in 2006/07.

### ***Crime and Community Safety: Perception of Anti-Social Behaviour***

108. Five NPIs are Place Survey measures that record the level of concern about anti-social behaviour, and satisfaction with residents over how anti-social behaviour is being tackled.
109. NPI21 shows that 29.3% of respondents agreed that the police and other local public bodies were successfully dealing with the issue. We believe that this is top quartile performance.
110. NPI27 shows that 29.4% of respondents agreed that the police and other local public bodies sought the people's views on Anti social behaviour and crime issues in the local area.
111. While these figures appear low, initial information is that they both represent top quartile performance.
112. NPI17 is an LAA measure described above. NPI41 and NPI42 are measures that go to make up the overall NPI17 figure. NPI41 shows that 18.4% of respondents were concerned about drunk or rowdy behaviour, while NPI42 shows that 17.3% of respondents were concerned with drug use or drug dealing. Again we believe that these are top quartile measures.
113. The talkabout 31 survey in July 2008 showed that 64% of residents felt York was a safe place to live (53% in 2006/7).

### ***Crime and Community Safety: Other Measures***

114. A number of other partner agencies have indicators in the national set. Probation have four indicators, DAAT have two, and NYFRS have two. In all cases data comes through the national hub, but no data has been made available by partners yet for 7 of these 8 NPIs.
115. NPI35 is an assessment of how we are responding to the national 'prevent' agenda (building resilience to violent extremism). York self assessed at level 2 – on a scale of 1 (worst) to 5 (best). Initial data from PWC suggests that a majority of authorities have self assessed at 2.

### **Other Priority (Directorate Plan) Local Performance Indicators**

116. Neighbourhood Services' 2008/09 Directorate Plan set out 13 priorities. Each priority had a small number of key actions and key measures. 6 of the priorities were organisational development priorities, and 7 of the priorities were outward 'service' delivery priorities.
117. On top of the NPIs reported above, 11 local priority indicators were set out in the directorate plan. These were :



- Place Survey measure: Satisfaction with keeping land free of litter and refuse
  - Place Survey measure: Satisfaction with waste collection services
  - Missed bins per 100,000 collections
  - Missed bins put right by end of next working day.
  - Number of waste related CRM system complaints
  - Urgent housing repairs completed within government time limits
  - Days taken to complete non-urgent housing repairs.
  - Total BCS crimes
  - Illegal alcohol sales via Test Purchase programme
  - % of residents who feel York is a safe city to live in
  - % of residents reporting noisy neighbours as a problem
118. The 6 organisational development priorities had 14 performance indicators around staff development, absence management, health and safety and equalities. 5 of the 14 are staff survey indicators and have not yet been reported at directorate level.
119. Most are improving. One indicator which is significantly off target is the % of EIAs completed by the end of the year. We only fully completed 1 of 9 impact assessments within the directorate equality scheme. DMT has now agreed an equality plan for 2009/10 and reiterated the need for service areas to complete a large programme of EIAs during 2009/10.

	Total reported	On target?	Improving?	Declining?	Stable?
Local Priority Indicators: Service	11 of 11 (100%)	5 of 11 (45%)	9 of 11 (82%)	1 of 11 (9%)	1 of 11 (9%)
Local Priority Indicators: Org Dev.	9 of 14 (57%)	5 of 8 (63%)	8 of 8 (100%)	0 of 8 (0%)	0

## **Overall Assessment on progress against the 2008/09 Directorate Plan**

120. The 2008/09 Directorate Service Plan set out 13 priorities. This table summarises performance against the actions and measures set out in that plan, and attempts to provide an overall rating of progress, and an overall assessment. Annex 2 provides more detail, but overall we delivered 70% of the plan.

Priority	Traffic Light Actions	Traffic Light Measures	Overall rating <sup>1</sup>	Overall Assessment
1 Absence Management	4 green, 1 amber	2 green, 3 amber	80%	Excellent direction of travel on both overall (28% fall) and stress related (42% fall) sickness, although still behind corporate average. Successful pilots on more proactive health and well-being.
2 Staff Development	5 green, 1 red	1 green, 2 amber	78%	96% appraisals undertaken. Communications and staff welfare measures in place.
3 Pay and Grading	1 green 1 amber	1 amber	67%	Morale has taken a battering despite NS doing all that we could to progress as quickly as possible. 100% of our JDs now agreed and in the appeals process. Close to final resolution.
4 Equalities	2 green, 2 amber, 2 red	1 red	43%	Good progress on training and awareness raising alongside corporate team. However failure to complete the programme of EIAs has hit the overall rating hard.
5 Health and Safety	1 green, 3 amber	3 green, 1 amber	75%	Good progress on systems, processes and culture. Fewer accidents overall and hit targets on major injuries and dangerous occurrences. No significant reduction on number of RIDDOR reports, but hint that the level of seriousness of these reports is reducing.
6 Financial Management	4 green, 1 amber	1 amber	83%	New FMS in and working. Very close to breakeven on net revenue budget.

<sup>1</sup> On basis of simple calculation – 1 mark for green, 0.5 mark for amber, totalled, and then divided by the total number of actions/measures.

7 Corporate Restructure	3 green	No measures	100%	Transfers completed successfully. Services maintained. Improvement work on Parking and Highway Infrastructure ongoing.
8 Community Safety	5 green	4 green, 1 amber, 1 red	86%	Overall crime has continued to fall – but at a slower rate. Perception of crime improved.
9 Neighbourhood Management	2 amber, 1 red	1 green	50%	York's approach to participatory budgeting recognised as best practice. Restructure of the NMU remains a key outstanding action.
10 Building Maintenance	2 green, 2 amber	1 green, 1 amber	75%	Key performance measures all improved despite increased volume of work. Work in progress levels have dropped. Financial position has improved. Customer satisfaction levels hit 90% in June 2008.
11. Local Environmental Quality	2 green, 1 amber, 3 red	1 amber 3 red,	25%	Poor year in relation to targets. All 5 of NPI195 and NPI196 regressed and missed targets. A number of key actions also missed. However performance still good compared to 2 years ago, and customer perception measures have held up. Much preparatory work undertaken with <a href="#">Easy@York</a> to introduce a new way of working which will help us work more efficiently and effectively.
12. Waste Management	4 green, 1 amber	4 green, 1 amber	90%	3 key NPIs improved and on target. Groves pilot underway and a clear path towards full recycling rollout by late 2010 is in place. Satisfaction with waste collection has improved which is pleasing as it suggests alternate week collection is gaining acceptability.
13. Refuse Service	1 green, 2 amber, 2 red	2 green, 2 amber	56%	Some key actions missed, but service quality indicators have good direction of travel. Further tough targets set for 2009/10. As LEQ, much preparatory work done through Easy refresh project to introduce more modern working practices.

Overall Development Priorities	20 green 8 amber 3 red	6 green 8 amber 1 red	26 green 16 amber 4 red	74%
Overall Service Priorities	14 green 8 amber 6 red	12 green 6 amber 4 red	26 green 14 amber 10 red	66%
Overall All Priorities	34 green 16 amber 9 red	18 green 14 amber 5 red	52 green 30 amber 14 red	70%

## **Consultation**

121. The report is primarily an information report for Members and therefore no consultation has been undertaken regarding its contents.

## **Options**

122. The report is primarily an information report for Members and therefore no specific options are provided to Members.

## **Corporate Priorities**

123. Three of the council corporate priorities are directly supported under this portfolio. They are:

- Decrease the tonnage of biodegradable waste and recyclable products going to landfill
- Improve the actual and perceived condition and appearance of the city's streets, housing estates and publicly accessible spaces
- Reduce the actual and perceived impact of violent, aggressive and nuisance behaviour on people in York.

## **Implications**

### **Financial**

124. The report provides details of the portfolio revenue and capital outturn and therefore implications are contained within the report

### **Human Resources**

125. There are no significant human resources implications.

### **Equalities**

126. There are no significant equalities implications.

### **Legal**

127. There are no significant legal implications.

### **Crime and Disorder**

128. There are no significant crime and disorder implications.

### **Information Technology**

129. There are no significant Information Technology implications.

### **Property**

130. There are no significant property implications.

## **Risk Management**

131. In compliance with the council's risk management strategy, there are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

## Recommendations

132. That the Scrutiny Committee approve the financial position of the portfolio and the carry forward requests.

Reason – In accordance with budgetary and performance monitoring procedures.

## Contact Details

### Author:

*Rachel Harrison  
Finance Manager  
Neighbourhood Services  
Tel No.553210*

*Mike Douglas  
Performance Manager  
Neighbourhood Services  
Ext 3227*

**Specialist Implications Officers**

### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Adam Wilkinson  
Interim Director Neighbourhood Services

Report Approved



Date 25 June 09

**Financial:** None

**Human Resources:** None

**Equalities:** None

**Legal:** None

**Crime and Disorder:** None

**Information Technology:** None

**Property:** None

**Risk Management:** None

**Wards Affected:** *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

## Background Papers:

2008/09 Budget Monitoring papers held at Neighbourhood Services

## Attached Annexes

- Annex 1 Major service variations against budget for non-traded services
- Annex 2 (Confidential) Final Outturn report for the traded accounts
- Annex 3 (Confidential) Major Service variations against budget for the traded accounts
- Annex 4 NS Performance Indicators – including LAA indicators, and priority local indicators set out in the directorate plan for 2008/09.
- Annex 5 Detailed information on progress against NS 2008/09 Directorate Plan.
- Annex 6 2009/10 Neighbourhood Services Directorate Plan